



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/088,674 06/02/98 MORGAN

D TI-25995

EXAMINER

LM02/0601

NGUYEN, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

ROBERT C KLINGER
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
PO BOX 655474 MS 219
DALLAS TX 75265

2774

DATE MAILED:

06/01/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/088,674

Applicant(s)

MORGAN ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
- ☐ received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) ____.
 - ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 6 are objected to because of the following informalities: a preamble states "...pulse width modulation...". However, the claims 1 and 6 recited "offsetting a first pixel...pixel value" were not described in the preamble. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishibashi et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,742,558).

3. As to claim 1-3 and 5, Ishibashi teaches a method which includes a rectangle A is defined by thick lines in (1) of fig. 12 and represents a block. Rectangles B1, B2, B3 and B4 defined by thick lines in (3) of fig. 12 represent pixels. A numeric value in each small rectangle represents a pixel value. Squares (2), (4) and (5) represent blocks, respectively. Numeric values in blocks (2) and (4) represent the average value of the block and the average value of the subblock B1, respectively (column 11, lines 36-48). As to claim 6-10, Ishibashi teaches the circuit coder 23" as illustrated in figure 16 and a display unit 16 (see figure 6). Accordingly, circuit coder corresponds to a logic circuit as claim.

4. As to claim 6-8 and 10, Ishibashi teaches a apparatus which includes the circuit coder 23" as illustrated in figure 16 and a display unit 16 as illustrated in figure 6. Accordingly, circuit coder corresponds to a logic circuit and display unit 16 corresponds to display means as claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishibashi et al in view of Guttage et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,309,551).

As to claims 4 and 9, Ishibashi teaches all of the claimed limitation with exception of the claimed bit map. Guttage teaches plane 0 to plane 3, 32 bits forming the 8 pixels 0-7 (see figure 5, column 10, lines 53-68) and video display 170 (see figure 1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the bit map display device taught by Guttage, would be compatible the apparatus as taught by Ishibashi in that a display compatible with an improvements in computer color graphics technology while reducing physical complexity of displaying images from a host computer with a graphics coprocessor where each has a bus (Guttage, column 3, lines 8-11).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No.	4,992,781	Iwasaki et al
U.S. Patent No.	5,543,819	Farwell et al
U.S. Patent No.	5,686,939	Millward et al
U.S. Patent No.	5,821,915	Graham et al
U.S. Patent No.	5,029,107	Lee

U.S. Patent No.	5,812,112	Helffferich
U.S. Patent No.	5,254,979	Trevett et al
U.S. Patent No.	5,784,055	Ngai
U.S. Patent No.	5,917,504	Yutaka et al
U.S. Patent No.	5,886,682	Biggs

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-6209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 am-5pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 703-305-4709. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-9051 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kevin M. Nguyen
May 23, 2000



RICHARD A. HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700